



## UWS Academic Portal

### Identifying with borders and boundaries

Wallace, David

*Published in:*

University–Community Partnerships for Promoting Social Responsibility in Higher Education

*DOI:*

[10.1108/S2055-364120200000023010](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120200000023010)

Published: 24/07/2020

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Wallace, D. (2020). Identifying with borders and boundaries: the place of critical pedagogy as social responsibility education. In E. Sengupta, P. Blessinger, & C. Mahoney (Eds.), *University–Community Partnerships for Promoting Social Responsibility in Higher Education* (Vol. 23, pp. 139-154). (Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning; Vol. 23). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120200000023010>

#### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [pure@uws.ac.uk](mailto:pure@uws.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Chapter:** Identifying with Borders and Boundaries: The Place of Critical Pedagogy as Social Responsibility Education

David Wallace

### **Abstract**

An approach to social responsibility in higher education will be proposed in this chapter and informed by a canon of literature and theorising on critical pedagogy (Freire, 1971; Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009; Giroux, 2011). Rooted in the work of education theorist Paulo Freire (1971, 1993) critical pedagogy embodies a set of critical dispositions about community, politics and education. Freire (1971, 1993) posited the nature of hope through transformative action in communities in which community empowerment arises from emerging critical consciousness and informed action. In common with the ideals of university-community partnerships critical pedagogy connects both to a community development mission and to an educational mission. However, though these principle philosophies of critical pedagogy may be inferred in the literature on civic universities, on higher education and public engagement, and on wider aspects of social responsibility in higher education (Webster & Dyball, 2010; Goddard and Kempton, 2016; UPP, 2019), the chapter will explore how they may be more centrally located in analysis and in practice development.

### **Introduction**

Critical pedagogy and its foundational theories are applied in institutional and community learning paradigms (Coburn & Wallace, 2011), form part of curricula as taught subject (Crowther et al, 2018; Milana et al. 2018), provide for an engagement in political process (Giroux, 2015), and is utilised in community development methodologies (Ledwith, 2001;

Beck & Purcell, 2010). However, its explicit application to considerations of social responsibility and community engagement in higher education is novel and largely absent from the literature. This chapter will address contemporary thinking around civic university ideals and will explore how critical pedagogy may be drawn as a framework to support a more effective and principled approach to community engagement and social responsibility in higher education. In particular it will provide a means of elaborating on borders and boundaries in institutional practices and will focus on the requirements of more sustainable and mutual community engagement.

Two apparently unrelated events coalesced as the inspiration for this chapter and in themselves encapsulate the scale of the issues that may be encountered when critiquing social responsibility in higher education. Firstly, in Michelle Obama's autobiography there is a section in which she portrays the elitism of her 'home' university the result of which being that she, and as she recounts it people like her from her home area, would not consider it possible that that university could be for them (Obama, 2018. p.147). Around the same time in the author's university in Scotland, an undergraduate student's research project (unpublished), which had as its subject community engagement and the university, produced similar findings. The student's research findings mirrored the exclusion articulated by Obama and though based in Scotland was essentially identifying with a similar range of community engagement failings. Providing a catalyst for theorising in this chapter then, the deduction is about the need for more effective engagement between higher education and local communities and in particular with those populations that may be defined as left behind or which suffer structural inequality. The chapter makes a case that public engagement should be in the DNA of universities as public institutions and that critical pedagogy provides a principled approach to inform mutual and empowering community engagement strategies.

## **Public Engagement – The Civic University**

The literature suggests that the effects of neoliberalism and corporate mechanisms prevail across large parts of higher education (Coffield & Williamson, 2011; Bergan & Harkavy, 2018; Griffin, 2014). However, despite these dominant trends, there are signs that such ideologies are contested and that democratising principles and community engagement practices remain both evident and relevant (Bender, 2008; Butcher et al., 2011; Bhagwan, 2018). There are contemporary illustrations of socially responsible practices in universities and in higher education policy in which social purpose, community engagement, and inclusion are characteristics of strategic planning (Bergan & Harkavy, 2018; Butcher et al., 2011; UPP, 2019).

For some time now universities in the United Kingdom have had public engagement strategies and a civic university movement is identifiable (Hooper, 2016; Goddard and Kempton, 2016; Bergan and Harkavy, 2018). Definitional reference points are not always consistent (Bender, 2012) but it is clear that, where priority is afforded to it, knowledge exchange is fortified by a rich and varied programme of projects and initiatives which are innovative in reaching out to the wider community in which the university is located. A range of core characteristics were identified in the Truly Civic report by UPP Civic University Commission (UPP, 2019). These characteristics are also consistent in principle with the seven characteristics of a civic university identified by Goddard and Kempton (2016) which offers a useful framework for social responsibility analysis and within which to locate an appraisal of the place of critical pedagogy principles in practice. The seven characteristics of civic university according to them are:

1. It is actively engaged with the wider world as well as the local community of the place in which it is located.
2. It takes a holistic approach to engagement, seeing it as institution wide activity and not confined to specific individuals or teams.
3. It has a strong sense of place – it recognises the extent to which its location helps to form its unique identity as an institution.
4. It has a sense of purpose – understanding not just what it is good at, but what it is good for.
5. It is willing to invest in order to have impact beyond the academy.
6. It is transparent and accountable to its stakeholders and the wider public.
7. It uses innovative methodologies such as social media and team building in its engagement activities with the world at large

These seven principles afford a structure to support and sustain community engagement and project a set of values and principles. However they do not explicitly convey an impetus toward social justice and the emphasis appears to be more weighted toward institutional development over community development. Never-the-less there is potential to take this structure in synthesis with critical pedagogy principles to offer a pathway to a more critically informed community engagement strategy.

Similarly in 2008 in the UK, the Beacons for Public Engagement Initiative was launched with a published aim of inspiring cultural change in how universities engage with the public

(Webster & Dyball, 2010). Six Beacon partnerships were created and resulted in a range of initiatives that included:-

- 1) a programme to develop skills and confidence in university staff and students in listening to and learning from publics across Wales;
- 2) fostering an informed climate to improve quality of life, support social and economic regeneration and inculcate civic values in East Anglia;
- 3) in Edinburgh a consortium of higher education institutions along with public policy, research and engagement organisations aspired to engage people in public policy issues (such as health and energy) by ensuring research expertise in these areas;
- 4) in Manchester there was an inter-university partnership that combined with the Museum of Science and industry to engage staff, students, local business, community groups and local people to develop, build and sustain public engagement and partnerships;
- 5) in Newcastle an inter-university partnership with the Centre for Life provided funding for 10 innovative projects to pilot public engagement strategies;
- 6) in London a new public engagement unit worked to embed public engagement across all university life through a continuous two way knowledge exchange between staff, students and people outside academia (NCCPE Web Site, accessed April, 2019).

These illustrations highlight how public engagement can form part of routine considerations for civic minded universities, can afford a rich and vibrant opportunity to engage with local communities and is of mutual benefit to the institutions and to the communities. The problem however is that community engagement in these ways, though innovative, is limited across higher education and does not appear to form part of universal planning (UPP, 2019).

Further there are discrete principles and values in each of these programmes and they do not have a coherent set of values and principles to unite these practices.

Critical pedagogy (Freire,1993: Giroux, 2011) and the critical theory (McLaren, 2009) that embodies its ideals offers not just a framework for action but a set of guiding principles that might inform aspects of teaching, research, citizenship, and knowledge exchange. Helping to pave the way for new and dialogical relationships with local grassroots communities this could build a critical mass of projects, proposals, and partnerships that could be consistent across the higher education sector and mutually beneficial to the community, to individual local people, to the staff in higher education and to the institutions involved.

### **Critical Pedagogy**

Though an embodiment of social responsibility in higher education, identifying with civil society and support for empowering community engagement never-the-less cuts against the corporatising grain in higher education (Giroux, 2015; Griffin, 2014). Pursuing such a course of action therefore requires intentionality, readiness to transgress boundaries in the face of institutional obstacles and calls for grounding in a shared democratic and pedagogical perspective (Ackland, Roberts, Swinney & Wallace., 2017). Social responsibility represents an impetus for community engagement that is participative and democratic in orientation, a locus in social democratic traditions which may not sit well with matters of managerialism in higher education or corporate control of such schemes. For meaningful community engagement with higher education however there is a requirement for an overarching theoretical framework around which academic staff and their scholarship can coalesce in the interests of dynamic engagement with the grassroots in the community (Butcher et al.2011).

*Critical pedagogy* offers such a framework and has its roots in Paulo Freire's conceptualisation of education as the practice of freedom (Freire, 1974). *Critical pedagogy* in its correlation with teaching and learning may be defined by the following principles (adapted from Macdonald, in Laker, 2002, pp 167-190):

1. It views knowledge and instruction as problematic;
2. It questions the ethical, social and political contexts in which instruction occurs;
3. It increases emphasis on developing critical and reflective capacities in learners;
4. It listens to learners voices shifting the traditional balance of power in the learning environment;
5. It aims to create social change toward more just and inclusive practices.

The underpinning philosophies that inform critical pedagogy are located with a body of work in critical theory that grew out of the intellectual traditions of the Frankfurt School from the 1920s (Ledwith, 2001; Macdonald, 2002; Milana et al. 2018). This critical social theory is predicated on the works of prominent scholars like Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, and Marcuse (Darder et al, 2009, p. 7). Though connected directly to radical and Marxist analysis the catalyst for critical pedagogy is neither formulaic nor homogeneous yet encapsulates both an emancipatory and democratic function and a commitment to the liberation of oppressed populations (Ledwith, 2001; Darder et al. 2009). The process of education emerging from this framework is proposed as praxis that is understood as action and reflection upon the world in order to change it (Grande, 2009, p. 206 as cited in Darder et al, 2009). Freire (1971) posited an approach to problem-based learning in which dialogue was central and from which critical reflection and critical consciousness emerged. This process is enacted by



problematizing taken-for-granted understandings and everyday contexts that may be the product of oppression or asymmetric relations of power (Freire, 1993; Giroux, 2011). In community development terms (Ledwith, 2001) this dialogical process may assist in problematizing potentially pathologising discourse that may result in local people (e.g. benefit recipients, lone parents, immigrants, young people) being labelled inappropriately or held accountable for issues that actually reside in structural failures in the economy or on state withdrawal from public services. The critical lens developed through critical pedagogy creates a capacity to see the historical constructions of power and the dominant culture and to interrogate this in relationship to the everyday cultural experiences of people who are subordinate to those in power (McLaren, 2009). Critical pedagogy therefore relates to a wider conception of education that connects to matters of politics and to matters of powerful learning within and beyond the institutions.

The political and empowering principles of critical pedagogy provide tenets for an operational code in higher education that explicitly encourages the kind of boundary crossing in which community and institutional values coalesce. The following table illustrates how the emphasis in community engagement utilising critical pedagogy principles may be compared with more traditional practices.

## TABLE 1 SHOULD APPEAR HERE

Critical pedagogy principles and values are expressed in a canon of literature influenced by the philosophy and writing of Paulo Freire (1971) and among more contemporary works by a range of theorists including Henry Giroux (2011; 2015). Darder et al. (2009) illuminate the pre-eminent role Freire played as founder of critical pedagogy, highlighting how the

philosophy he articulates about education transcends schooling (and forms of institutional education) to encompass societal questions of power, culture and oppression. Freire's views on emancipatory education were grounded in aspects of social agency, voice and democratic participation – characteristics that are viewed by Darder et al. (2009) as highly relevant for modern society and informing contemporary writings on critical pedagogy. Developing these themes in a rich canon of work, Giroux (2011, p. 4) offers some guidance for social responsibility in universities when he asserts his critical pedagogy principles as being

grounded in critique as a mode of analysis that interrogates texts, institutions, social relations and ideologies as part of the script of official power...critique focusses largely on how domination manifests as both a symbolic and an institutional force and the ways in which it impacts on all levels of society. (Giroux, 2014, p. 4)

Core philosophical principles from critical pedagogy that underpin this critical analysis and that may inform community engagement and social responsibility in higher education include, (1) historicity of knowledge; (2) cultural politics; (3) political economy; and (4) dialectical theory (Darder et al, 2009). Each of these will now be taken in turn and appraised in the light of their relevance in the context of an application to community engagement in higher education.

*Historicity of knowledge* as an underpinning philosophy of critical pedagogy may be closely aligned within the academy in terms of the scholarship of epistemology (Douglas, 2012; Scotland, 2012). Critical pedagogy provides an analysis which highlights the historical context within which knowledge is made and remade. Higher education requires analysis therefore not only of contemporary and powerful social practices but also of the historical

events that inform orthodoxies and doctrines. Critical pedagogy provides an impetus for those in higher education (especially students, teachers and researchers) for an engagement with the historicity of knowledge. The catalyst then is to see injustice in its historical context and come to a recognition that such conditions are historically produced by human beings and therefore may be transformed by human beings – defining a key role for agency and the possibility of change in communities (Darder et al, 2009).

With reference to *cultural politics* (Giroux, 2001), orthodoxies and routines of practice in higher education may be undemocratic and monolithic, and difficult if not impossible for local people in the community to navigate productively. For staff in higher education there is a requirement to adapt and adopt empowering and participative strategies that develop and enact a new and more porous culture. The objective is explicitly to open up the system in a way that engages with and empowers culturally marginalised and economically disenfranchised groups and communities. Offering a critique of those process and systems that regulate or inhibit empowering practices in higher education is an exercise in articulating ideological toxins associated with lived experiences and shaped by history. Of particular resonance is the requirement to build a critical analysis and an investigation of traditional theories and practices in higher education that may thwart the development of an emancipatory culture of participation (Kincheloe et al. (2017). Asymmetrical relations of power may be sustained yet treated as common sense, neutral or apolitical (Freire, 1993). Critical pedagogy seeks to address cultural politics by supporting a more inclusive and liberatory stance and, through dialogue and problem posing affording a process in which power is explicitly acknowledged, critiqued and diffused (Freire 1971; Coburn and Wallace, 2011; Milana et al. 2018).

With respect to *political economy*, the contestation is that traditional orthodoxy in schooling and wider structures of education serve particular class structures (Gramsci, 1986; McLaren, 2009; Daldal, 2014). Those with the highest incomes and social capital tend to benefit most. In this analysis higher education may be viewed therefore in the replication of the cultural values and privileges of the dominant class. Critical pedagogy takes a role therefore in contesting claims that traditional education provides equal opportunity and equal access for all. These asymmetric relationships of power serve rather to govern aspects of the social order in a way that Gramsci defined as cultural hegemony (Burke, 2005). The effect of this may be observable in the community and defined inappropriately as apathy, parochialism, or anti-intellectualism.

*Dialectical theory* (Brookfield, S. p.58. cited in Milana et al. 2018) contests traditional theories of education embodied in institutions of schooling and higher education that tend to reinforce positivism, certainty, and technical control of knowledge and power. Critical pedagogy promotes a dialectical and constructivist view of knowledge and, as a counter hegemonic principle, seeks to problematise the taken-for-granted and highlight contradictions (Allman, P., p.419, cited in Darder et al, 2009). Thus new ways of constructing thought and interrogating common sense understandings may be considered and a more fluid and relational view of human nature may be deduced.

These core components of the dialectic in critical pedagogy – historicity of knowledge, cultural politics, political economy, and dialectical theory - are represented here in summary to offer some content for an analytical framework from critical pedagogy principles. When synthesised they afford the possibility of a systematic rationale for university engagement

with the community in class-struggles, racial and gender inequalities, and in action for social justice. Analysis of these four components could be undertaken by staff in higher education as part of a Freireian decoding exercise (Freire, 1971). By these means higher education staff interrogate the ideas together as a form of discourse analysis and dialogue, a dialectic process of clarifying and establishing principles for community engagement practice in individual institutions (Lucio-Villegas, p.157, cited in Milana et al. 2018). The democratic model in question is pluralist in orientation, encouraging educators to build political participation through habits of critical reflexivity, critique and dissent. The foundation principles here equate with community development paradigms (Ledwith, 1997 & 2001). These are rooted in socialist and feminist traditions and recognise a requirement for grassroots movements to build equality, social justice and democracy from the bottom up as well as from the top down (Beck & Purcell, 2010; Crowther et al, 2017). In Freireian terms, this aspect of critical pedagogy has a core concern with oppression and the consequent potential for transformation through cultural action (Freire, 1993; Ledwith, 2001). Located in structural inequality, transformation emerges in community engagement through which local people develop critical consciousness and take action for the common good. This suggests that for social responsibility in higher education to be meaningful, a theory of transformative action is required (Freire, 1993, p. 107). However, Freire is prescient in reminding dominant elites that this cannot arise in the context of ‘manipulation, sloganizing, depositing, regimentation and prescription’ (Freire, 1993, p.107). The facilitation of dialogue between the university and the community must be in the interests of the oppressed people operating as subjects of their own transformation. This was defined by Freire as intercommunication and as a ‘praxis of the people’ (Freire, 1993, p. 111).

## **Border Pedagogies**

Like all major institutions, higher education is shaped by a complex and powerful set of rules, paradigms and beliefs, many of which are invisible, but which can coalesce as cultural hegemony (Griffin, 2014; Giroux, 2015; Humes, 2018). Dominant practices and disciplinary boundaries are constructed and strictly demarcated in historical, intellectual, cultural, and social domains e.g. schools, faculties, cognate areas of research, disciplines and courses (Brown-Luthango, 2012; Bender, 2008; Bergan & Harkavy, 2018). Powerful and doctrinaire social practices that are inward looking therefore emerge over time and are embedded in institutional routines that can appear as common sense and axiomatic (Giroux, 2001; Grande, 2009). The result for many in higher education is that the surrounding community is at best a potential resource when seeking research participants or students. For many in the university, the surrounding community exists only in its absence from day to day considerations. Institutional practices may be collectively represented therefore as an exclusive realm, access to which is denied to the ordinary citizen (Obama, 2018; Bergan & Harkavy, 2018). Boundaries and borders are consequently created between people within the university; boundaries and borders are created between the university and those external to it; and, most evidently such boundaries and borders may be construed as barriers in the relationships between the university as an institution and the community within which it is hosted in terms of its neighbours, non-academic networks and the wider public. To affect change in the university in the interests of social responsibility such borders and how they are governed need to be acknowledged and made permeable (Giroux, 2005).

To ameliorate restrictive demarcation, Giroux (2005, p. 69) therefore proposes breaking down disciplinary boundaries and creating new spheres in which knowledge can be produced. Coining the term *border pedagogy* he argues that this provides a means of obtaining new forms of knowledge. Thus, border pedagogy requires considerations of ontology and

epistemology (Douglas, 2012; Scotland, 2012) and leads to the edges of discrete disciplinary and practice domains in universities, potentially opening up the prospect using this lens, of new paradigms of social responsibility for higher education, new interdisciplinary partnerships and new partnerships with communities. Dialogue and empowering practices are principled components of this process as is a recognition of powerful learning that arises in the context of mutually beneficial partnership and co-production. Giroux (2005, p. 69) sees this as reclaiming and remaking identities by working across boundaries in the interests of constructing more democratic and just forms of life. A form of constructive alignment arises when ontological, epistemological and methodological considerations such as these are developed in ways that operationalise principles of community engagement. Such partnerships between higher education institutions and other organisations have been defined as having two possible faces – transformational or transactional (Butcher, Bezzina & Moran, 2011, p. 31). The latter emanates from pragmatism and recognition of the individual benefits to be accrued for participating parties. In keeping with Giroux’s sentiments the transformational partnership reflects a “moral dimension” characterized by partners coming “together to pursue common purpose and create the possibility of generative growth and change through mutual interaction as they apply their resources to addressing complex problems” (Butcher et al., 2011, p. 31). The benefits of this may be evidenced in dynamic and engaging partnerships with the community. It is these considerations of border and boundary crossing and the use of appropriate tools and methods that may therefore facilitate the creation of new spheres of knowledge production in higher education:

- Where social practices can be explored, critiqued and (re)constructed to create possibilities for learning and knowledge exchange within and outwith the university

- Where the social construction of ideas can be made available for questioning through dialogue within and outwith the university and through which new ideas, meanings and understandings are generated; and
- Where learning across borders can be a catalyst for social change as an embodiment of social responsibility education

Adapted from Coburn (2010, p. 33)

In the light of the neoliberal impulse impinging on much of higher education (Griffin, 2014; Giroux, 2015) individuals engaged in scholarship and academic work may be defined as private intellectuals serving specific personal and faculty needs in terms of institutional standing and career aspirations. Material benefits are recorded in terms of scholarly output, professional recognition and reputational work for the institutions (Griffin, 2014). In short it is apparently about commodifying knowledge and it is about generating income. In contrast to these trends and with a more communitarian impulse, Griffin (2014, p. 230) highlights the role staff play as ‘public intellectuals’. In this respect he echoes a wider critique provided by Giroux (2015, p. 99), in which the public intellectual must actively engage in politics as a means to defy a populist hegemony. This is representative of a larger political project in which public intellectuals ‘have a responsibility to share a commitment to language as a site of experimentation, power, struggle, and hope in the interests of building democratic social movements that are inspired and informed’. It is the actions and dispositions of public intellectuals in this way that exemplify border pedagogies and pave the way for moving beyond institutional systems to cross over to co-production and dialogue with community participants.



This social and democratic turn, developing from the ideals of the public intellectual is redolent too of the works of Gramsci (Burke, 1999 & 2005) and suggests that traditional intellectuals (university academics in this case) if appropriately and critically engaged may provide a catalyst for the creation of both ‘organic’ and ‘working class’ intellectuals (Burke, 1999 & 2005). The Gramscian reference to organic intellectuals may be equated with an educated professional class of lecturers, teachers, community workers, social workers and youth workers. The principle is that these practitioners, routinely qualified to practice through higher education, enter communities and may stimulate counter hegemony by supporting the education and activism of the working class (thus building a cadre of working class intellectuals). It must be recognised however that Gramsci’s theorising in his prison notebooks (1986) is partly based on a deep suspicion of such traditional intellectuals and their vested interests, suggesting they could not be trusted with a counter hegemonic tradition.

## **Discussion**

To build on practical and attainable examples and to offer a framework for community engagement, the chapter proposes civic engagement as a foundation for social responsibility in higher education. It goes further however by drawing on traditions of critical pedagogy to argue that civic engagement requires explicit purpose and direction if it is to avoid becoming tokenistic. Though advocacy of community partnerships in this way may be a radical departure for some in higher education, the aim will be to avoid what Baum (2000) identifies as the fantasies and rather to concentrate on the realities in university community partnerships. However, to accept the case that elitism and exclusion in university cultures is problematic requires a critical reflection in higher education of doctrinaire hegemony. It further requires a critical appraisal of structural inequalities and an examination of the role that higher education plays in ameliorating or perpetuating such inequalities. Identifying key

principles for community engagement in this way explicitly intends to inform action by individual staff, individual faculty or indeed entire institutions. This stance has two central foundations (1) division in society depletes us all, serves as a form of oppression, and requires tools to articulate, understand, and address such oppression; and (2) striving for social responsibility in higher education is in essence a democratising process toward social justice that requires a critical theory and transformative action. Indeed Samardzic-Markovic in the preface to the Council for Europe document on *Higher Education for Diversity, Social Inclusion and Community*, asserts a democratic imperative for higher education:

Higher education is not just well placed to further diversity, social inclusion and community. Higher education has a moral duty to do so, and we need not look far to see why this is a more important part of the mission of higher education than ever before. (Bergan & Harkavy, 2018, p.5)

At the time of writing there is a period of political turmoil shaped by post truth politics and populism that combined, undermine and disparage progressive scholarship ideals, and democratic intellect (Giroux, 2015; Waisbord, 2018). Assaults on critical thinking, climate change denial and anti-vaccination tropes currently represent the apotheosis of this phenomenon (Braun, 2019). Higher education, as Samardzic-Markovic (Bergan and Harkavy, 2018) attests, cannot therefore sit on the side-lines in what is potentially a post-truth, fake-news, alt-right assault on dispassionate and critical scholarship and on democratic values and social justice (Braun, 2019; Griffin, 2014). In response to such conditions the imperative of informed and principled community engagement assumes greater significance for higher education.

Never-the-less the ‘ivory towers’ syndrome’ remains evident in global university trends (Brown-Luthango, 2013; Obahma, 2018; Hooper, 2016; Humes,2018). Brown-Luthango, (2013, p. 312) highlights how this circumstance sees the diminution of scholarship forms such as the scholarship of integration (involving interdisciplinary forms of research collaboration and making connections across disciplines); scholarship of application (in which there is an application of knowledge to pressing social challenges); and a scholarship of teaching (in which collaborative and problem-based strategies are valued over individualised and banking approaches to learning).

The trend in universities instead is predominately toward business models of operation and toward scientific rationality (Griffin, 2014; Giroux, 2015). The emphasis is invariably on the scholarship of discovery over other scholarship forms that may be more complementary to community engagement and civic university ideals. When consolidated and legitimated by neoliberal and corporatising frameworks in higher education, planning and policy for scholarship and for partnerships tends to reflect these ideological orthodoxies. Such regimes therefore tend by default to devalue community engagement practices and mitigate against forms of scholarship and partnerships that may be more collegiate, democratising and complementary to social justice ends (Kincheloe et al, 2017).

John Dewey (1987) wrote that education is predicated on a democratic impulse and on the engagement of community. Indeed Dewey defined democracy as a shifting and dynamic process that required nurturing and renewal through various forms of community association so that it may be made and remade over time (Dewey, 1991, as cited in Joseph Rowntree Trust, 2006, p. 118). Emphasising public responsibility and a sense of national identity, the

democratic intellect espoused by Davie (1961) similarly gives emphasis to a conception of the good life and the good society through principles of ‘intellectual breadth, philosophical grounding and social commitment’ (Humes, 2018, p. 81). It is these principles that offer a possible corrective to the corporate and neoliberal hegemony that is espoused as strategy across much of the contemporary higher education sector (Humes, 2018, p. 79). And it is these principles that provide a solid foundation for advancing conceptions of community engagement and social responsibility in higher education.

If the principles for critical community engagement articulated in this chapter inspire curiosity or a desire for further action then there are a range of publications and ideas that can be accessed at the web site of the national coordinating centre for public engagement (NCCPE, 2018). These are not strictly critical pedagogy in orientation but afford the kind of creative stimulus that may serve as a catalyst for further action in higher education. There are creative approaches to work on public policy issues, environmental matters and on using university resources to support and sustain ideas which essentially offer hope of community development.

Brown-Luthango (2012) alludes to the strategic planning and resolve required of such work and like a number of authors suggests that it calls for a transformation of the institutional context within universities. The various actors in this community engagement endeavor (in the community and in higher education) will be required to acknowledge the degree of time, effort and resource investment required of such engagements. The establishment and maintenance of working relationships in communities speaks to a need for dialogue and trust emerging over the medium to longer term and is therefore not a short term fix. Such

relationship building requires sensitivity, ethical practice and a concern above all to achieve social justice. For the university to truly take up the challenge of community engagement informed by critical pedagogy, strategic priorities and resources will be required to ensure that such engagement is given status and value. This may then complement the status and value afforded to matters of income generation, research and teaching. The result, if carefully supported and managed, may see the creation, maintenance and sustaining of effective community engagement programmes which are mutually beneficial to the university and the community and which inform and stimulate ideals of civic engagement.

The literature that informs the principles of community engagement articulated here requires careful analysis to ensure that concepts and ideas of civic university and community engagement are not simply fudged (Bender, 2008) or reduced to lowest common denominator in the form of short term planning or marginal programme development. Critical pedagogy affords theoretical and critical ballast providing both an urgent rationale for such engagement and a set of guiding principles for the conduct of those in higher education associating with the grassroots in communities. That this strategy for social responsibility requires forethought and sustainable longer term planning is evident in the sentiments of the ACU (2001) which refers to strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world and the taking on of wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens. The literature, whilst eschewing elitist and neoliberal impulses in higher education, points to a more egalitarian and empowering possibility for community engagement and social responsibility (Bender, 2008; Bok, 1998; Coffield and Williamson, 2011; Douglas, 2012; Hooper, 2016). In the final analysis, what the university does is the clearest indication of where it stands in terms of civil society, civic engagement and social responsibility. Critical pedagogy offers a framework within which to open and build dialogue and to afford a

dialectic response to collegiate processes required to make community engagement a strategic priority.

## **Conclusion**

A combination of expertise, empathy and resilience are required to ensure that programmes of community engagement are nurtured and developed in partnership with others over the medium to longer term and are not simply viewed as short-term or temporary expedients. Butcher et al (2011) identify with five guiding principles that inform community engagement through transformational partnerships Vis:

1. Work out of shared purpose
2. Lead collaboratively
3. Relate on a basis of trust
4. Ensure appropriate and adequate resources; and
5. Remain open to learning and change

Honesty, reciprocity and mutual respect are the identified building blocks for the effective realisation of these principles. Though Butcher et al. (2011) did not relate to critical pedagogy principles per se, it is clear that dialogue was also foundational for them reflecting a Freirian principle that all could be learners and all could be teachers (Freire, 1971, p. 39). The joint agenda setting required of the authentic engagement they identify is redolent of Freireian generative themes (Beck & Purcell, 2010) and runs parallel to a problem posing methodology around which issues of concern can be identified collaboratively and mutual objectives agreed between the university and the community.

Critical pedagogy can therefore be attainable and affords the possibility of intellectual and strategic critique of the social responsibility of universities and of renewed possibilities in community engagement. Fundamentally this chapter seeks to develop the focus on to networking relations in universities which often privilege particular types of partnerships over others. For example liaison with business and enterprise communities is routine and evidenced in corporate structures, sponsorship and corporate behaviours (Griffin, 2014, Coffield & Williamson, 2011). By contrast the literature confirms that formal networking and partnership with grassroots communities or with community development ideals, does not significantly feature as priority in strategic considerations within and across higher education (Hooper, 2016; UPP, 2018; Weerts, 2019).

The adage is that knowledge is power. Higher education is a knowledge creator and currently generates and distributes knowledge in a number of ways that support institutional mission, government programmes, innovation and science and the advancement of humankind. The mechanisms by which this knowledge is transmitted utilises a type of grid that is hard wired to connect with hubs that constitute polity, business, academia, and partners. The thesis here is that this network does not reach sufficiently well into neighbouring communities and in to a grassroots where structural inequality exists. If represented on a graphic it is clear that around many higher education institutions there would be bright nodes of engagement whilst neighbouring communities in greatest need remain largely in darkness. The philosophy and analysis that informs this chapter draws on principles for critical pedagogy and is explicitly designed to stimulate the creation of new networks so that the supply can reach new nodes in grassroots communities.





## References

- Ackland, A., Roberts, G., Swinney, A., & Wallace, D. (2017). A Scottish consortium of higher and further education institutions: developing collaboration through critical incidents. in B.,Cozza, & P. Blessinger, *University partnerships for pre-service and teacher development - innovations in higher education teaching and learning*, Volume 10, pp. 17-32, United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing
- Baum, H. (2000). Fantasies and realities in university-community partnerships, *Journal of Planning Educational Research*, 20, pp. 234-246.
- Beck, D., & Purcell R (2010). *Popular education practice for youth and community development work*. Series: Empowering youth and community work practice. Exeter: Learning Matters
- Bender, G. (2008). Exploring conceptual models for community engagement at higher education institutions in South Africa, *Perspectives in Education*, 6 (1) March 2008
- Bergan, S. & Harkavy, I. (2018). *Higher education for diversity, social inclusion and community*, Strasbourg: Council for Europe Publishing
- Bhagwan, R. (2018). University-community partnerships: demystifying the process of engagement, *South African Review of Sociology*, 49:3-4, 32-54.
- Bok, D. (1984). *Beyond the ivory tower: social responsibilities in the modern university*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Braun, K. (2019). Unpacking post-truth, *Critical Policy Studies*, 13:4, pp. 432-436,
- Brown-Luthango, M. (2013). Community-university engagement: the Philippi CityLab in Cape Town and the challenge of collaboration across boundaries, *Higher Education* 65:309–324.
- Burke, B. (1999, 2005). ‘Antonio Gramsci, schooling and education’, *the encyclopaedia of informal education*, retrieved from <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-gram.htm>.
- Butcher, J., Bezzina, M., & Moran, W. (2011). Transformational partnerships: A new agenda for higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 36(1), 29 - 40.

- Coburn, A. (2010). Youth work as border pedagogy. in Batsleer, J. and Davies. B. (2010)- *What is youth work*, Exeter: Learning Matters
- Coburn, A., & Wallace, D. (2011). *Youth work in communities and schools* Edinburgh: Dunedin
- Coffield, F. & Williamson, B. (2011). *From exam factories to communities of discovery – The Democratic Route*, London: Trentham
- Crowther, J., Ackland, A., Petrie, M., & Wallace, D. (2017). Adult education, community and learning for democracy in Scotland. in Noblit, N. (Ed) *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Daldal, A. (2014). Power and ideology in Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci – a comparative analysis, *Review of History and Political Science* June 2014, 2, 2, pp. 149-167
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., Torres, R. (Eds) (2009). *The critical pedagogy reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) Oxon: Routledge
- Davie, G. E. (1961). *The democratic intellect: Scotland and her universities in the 19<sup>th</sup> century*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Davie, G. E. (1986). *The crisis of the democratic intellect*, Edinburgh: Polygon
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, New York: Seaboury
- Dewey, J. (1987). Education and social change. in Boydson, J.A. (1987) *John Dewey: The later works. Volume. 11*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, pp. 408–20.
- Douglas, S. (2012). Advancing the scholarship of engagement: an institutional perspective, *South African Review of Sociology*, 3, 2, pp. 27-39

- Gamble, D. (2013). Participatory methods in community practice. in Weil, M., (Ed) (2013) *The handbook of community practice (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education, toward a pedagogy for the opposition*  
London: Bergen and Garvey
- Giroux, H. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*, New York: Continuum
- Giroux, H. (2015). *Education and the crisis of public values (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, New York: Peter Laing
- Giroux, H. (2005). *Border crossings*, Oxford: Routledge
- Goddard, J., & Kempton, L. (2016). *The civic university in the leadership and management of place*,  
Newcastle: Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, Newcastle University.  
Retrieved from <https://www.ncl.ac.uk/media/wwwnclacuk/curds/files/university-leadership.pdf>
- Gramsci, A. (1986). *Selection from prison notebooks*. London: Laurence & Wishart
- Grande, S. (2009). American Indians geographies of identity and power: at the crossroads of indigena and mestizaje. in Darder et al (eds) (2009) *The critical pedagogy reader (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)* Oxon: Routledge pp.183-208.
- Griffin, D. (2014). *Education reform: the unwinding of intelligence and creativity*, New York: Springer
- Hooper, D. (2016). *Supporting thriving communities – The role of universities in reducing inequality*  
London: University Alliance
- Humes, W. M. (2018). Scottish higher education in Bryce, T.G.K., Humes, W.M., Gillies, D. & Kennedy, A. *Scottish Education (5<sup>th</sup> Edition)* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

- Joseph Rowntree Trust, (2006), *Power to the people – the report of power: An independent inquiry into Britain's democracy*. York: York Publishing Distribution
- Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., Steinberg, S. R., & Monzó, L. (2017). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Advancing the bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). pp. 235-260. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ledwith, M. (1997). *Participation in transformation – towards a working model of community empowerment*, Birmingham: Venture Press
- Ledwith, M. (2001). Community work as critical pedagogy: re-envisioning Freire and Gramsci, *Community Development Journal*, 36, 3. pp. 171-18
- Lucio-Villegas, E. (2018). Revisiting Paulo Freire: Adult education for emancipation. in Milana, M., Webb, S., Holford, J., Waller, R., & Jarvis, P. (2018) *The Palgrave International Handbook on Adult and Lifelong Education and Learning*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Macdonald, D. (2002). Critical pedagogy, what might it look like and why does it matter. in Laker, A. (ed). *The sociology of sport and physical education* London: RoutledgeFalmer
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy; A look at the major concepts. in Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (Eds) (2009) *The critical pedagogy reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) Oxon: Routledge
- Milana, M., Webb, S., Holford, J., Waller, R., & Jarvis, P. (2018). *The Palgrave international handbook on adult and lifelong education and learning*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) (2018). *What works, engaging the public through social media* Bristol: Bristol University. Retrieved from <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/nccpe-projects-and-services/completed-projects/beacons-public-engagement>

- Obama, M. (2018) *Becoming* London: Penguin Books
- Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms *English and Language Teaching*. 5, 9, pp. 9-16.
- UPP Foundation (2018) civic university commission progress report. Retrieved from <https://upp-foundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/UPP-Foundation-Civic-University-Commission-Progress-Report.pdf>
- UPP Foundation (2019) Truly civic: strengthening the connection between universities and their places Retrieved from <https://upp-foundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/UPP-Foundation-Civic-University-Commission-Progress-Report.pdf>
- Waisbord, S. (2018). The elective affinity between post-truth communication and populist politics, *Communication Research and Practice*, 4:1, 17-34
- Webster, T., & Dyball, M. (2010) *Independent review of beacons for public engagement evaluation findings, final report for RCUK, HEFC and the Wellcome Trust*, London: People, Science and Policy Ltd
- Weerts, D. (2019). Resource development and the community engagement professional: building and sustaining engaged institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 3, 1 pp. 9-33.

**Table 1. Comparing traditional university partnerships with community partnerships guided by crucial pedagogy**

<b>Traditional Community Engagement</b>	<b>Critical Pedagogy informed Community Engagement</b>
Community partners are empty vessels receptive to direction by university staff	Community partners are seen as potential agents who can re-create the world from their own experiences
The university is the sole arbiter in necessary information that is to be passed on	University staff and community partners work together as co-learners, co-investigators and co-producers
University staff provide the expertise and community partners subscribe to the university initiative	Operating collectively there is active facilitation of dialogue, analysis, agenda setting, planning, action and evaluation
The university staff lead the process and set the agenda to reflect university interests and priorities	The basis of community engagement is set by the interests and concerns of the community with a focus on pressing problems or conditions
Knowledge is seen as objective, as a collection of impersonal, technical facts that have little to do with everyday life	Knowledge is subjectively, personally and socially constructed. Knowledge emerges from everyday life experiences
The university and its staff is assumed to be neutral, objective and distanced from social, economic and environmental conflict	The community partnership acknowledges a commitment to the marginalised groups and a concern for oppressive structural conditions
The purpose of higher education is to promote approved sociocultural knowledge and values directly to the community	The purpose of higher education is to assist communities to learn from their experiences, critically appraise the context of their conditions and to plan for collective action.